

## QUESTIONS FOR ANSWERS ON THE DAY.

(but not taken up)

### Construction of new Tanks in Holalkere Taluk.

\*Q.—457. Sri G. DUGGAPPA (Holalkere).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether the Public Works Department has investigated the possibilities of constructing new tanks near (1) Kagalagere (2) Devarahosahally (3) Hanumali and (4) Gulihosally in Holalkere Taluk ;

(b) if so, whether any estimates have been prepared ;

(c) whether these estimates have been sanctioned ?

A.—Sri ALUR HANUMANTHAPPA (Deputy Minister for Minor Irrigation).—

(a) and (b) Kagalagere and Devarahosahally Projects have been investigated and estimates prepared. The other two projects have neither been investigated nor estimates prepared.

(c) No.

### Installation of a Sulphuric Acid Plant at Ingaldhal in Chitradurga Taluk.

\*Q.—598. Sri V. MASIYAPPA (Hiriyur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) the nature of work that is being done in the Ingaldhal Sulphur Mines in Chitradurga Taluk ;

(b) whether they propose to instal a sulphuric acid plant in that place ;

(c) if so, within what period ?

A.—Sri K. MALLAPPA (Minister for Industries and Commerce).—

(a) Prospecting operations are being carried out at Ingaldhal to find out the extent of the deposit and its quality.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

2-00 P.M.

## MYSORE STAMP (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1962.

### Motion to consider Clauses

(Debate continued.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—We had finished clause 16 and were about to take up clause 17 yesterday. To clause 17, there is an amendment given notice of by Sri G. V. Gowda. Is he moving it ?

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palya).—Yes, Sir. I beg to move :

“That item (ii) of the proposed Section 52 A, shall be deleted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That item (ii) of the proposed Section 52 A, shall be deleted.”

†Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, yesterday, I moved an amendment to clause 16 opposing the proviso that the Government wanted to add. Since a proviso is there, I think there is no need for item (ii) of the new clause—52 A.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble member need not have moved it, then.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I have moved for the deletion of item (ii), because the purpose served by item (ii) of clause 52 A would be served by the proviso added yesterday : “Notwithstanding anything in the preceding sections of this Chapter, the State Government, after consultation with the Chief Controlling Revenue Authority, if satisfied that it is just equitable to grant relief in any case or class of cases, (i) other than those to which any of the said sections is applicable; or (ii) after the period specified in any of the said sections...” So, the Government has got power to sanction the refund of the amount under clause 16 even after the expiry of the period of limitation. Therefore, there is no need to retain item (ii), when the same purpose could be served by the proviso to clause 16.

Sri M. V. KRISHNAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—We do not agree to that, Sir.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I would like to withdraw the amendment by the leave of the House.